

every company will qualify for the cap. During debate in this chamber in July, members were very explicit in expressing concerns that certain companies should be excluded from the liability cap. My amendment does just that.

Indeed, my amendment is limited to those companies that had contracted with the Federal Aviation Administration but which had commenced services no later than February 17, 2002. The key and determining factor is when the screening services actually commenced regardless of the date on which the contract was actually executed. In addition, companies that had been debarred from doing business with the Federal Government for any period of time—even as little as a single day—within six months after February 17, 2002 would not be eligible under any circumstances for coverage under the cap. In the event a debarred company was subsequently reinstated as a government contractor, they still would not qualify for the cap.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my amendment accomplishes the clear intent of Congress when it passed the Stabilization Act last year. Private screening companies were in no better position to foresee or prevent the events of September 11 than any private or governmental entity. Therefore, fairness and equity demand that we restore the cap under specific terms and conditions. However, my amendment also responds to the concerns of members of this chamber. Indeed, let me repeat. The language in Section 890 makes explicitly clear that only those companies that are in good standing with the government as evidenced by the fact that a company commenced aviation passenger screening services for the government no later than February 17 of this year qualify for the cap. Further, a company would not be eligible if it had been debarred for any length of time within six months from that date.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my explanation will assist my colleagues to better understand the nature and purpose of my amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I most regretfully withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 3529, ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WORKER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3529) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and assistance to displaced workers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive speakers and recorded on pages 712 through 713 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request to consider a House bill with a Senate amendment at the Speaker's table until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leader-

ship. Therefore, the Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman for that request.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I heard what the Speaker had to say, but I think I can indicate that the minority would be very pleased to bring this up and, therefore, I think what the Speaker's ruling is indicating is that the majority does not wish to proceed. I believe I can speak clearly, and maybe I should leave it to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), to say that the minority desires that this matter be brought up at this time, and I would, therefore, yield as part of my inquiry to Mr. HOYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not yield to another Member on a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman's statement, of course, will appear in the record.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. If, in fact, under the rules I indicate on behalf of the minority that we have no objection to that unanimous consent request, what effect would that have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would read directly from page 713 of the House Rules Manual where it states that, "It is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request. Therefore, the gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry."

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. With all due respect, that was not my assertion, nor my question. My assertion was that in the event that I indicate to the Speaker that the minority side has no objection to the unanimous consent request propounded by the gentleman from Michigan to allow the unemployment extension bill to be immediately considered, would that have any effect under the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would repeat, once again, that under the clear precedents of the House, it is required that any measure such as that be cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership going back to precedent established

under Speaker O'Neill. It must be a bipartisan floor and committee leadership approval process.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to inquire whether the congressional letter gathering a number of Members addressed to the Speaker of the House has been submitted into the RECORD asking for H.R. 3529 to be passed by unanimous consent, a letter that was directed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), has that been presented to the House or to the RECORD of the House at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no specific knowledge. Of course, any Member may ask unanimous consent to have a letter or a document inserted into the RECORD.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me just ask unanimous consent for such a letter to be submitted into the RECORD, along with a letter that I have submitted as well to the Speaker on this issue of H.R. 3529 to be brought up on unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman's document may be submitted for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 21, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: More than 800,000 jobless Americans will lose their unemployment compensation three days before the New Year if Congress leaves town without passing extension legislation. Senate Republican Whip Don Nickles worked diligently last week to broker a compromise bill, H.R. 3529, which the House has the option of passing by unanimous consent tomorrow before it adjourns sine die. We can think of no reason why the House of Representatives, which is in session tomorrow, would be unable to pass the bipartisan compromise extension that was passed in the Senate last week. But we can think of 800,000 reasons for the House to act tomorrow.

The San Francisco Chronicle quoted White House officials as saying that "the President believes it's important to protect unemployed workers" and has been lobbying for a compromise to be reached. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3529 is that compromise. Not only would it ensure that workers receive their full thirteen weeks of extended compensation, but it would provide much needed relief to those who are about to exhaust their regular unemployment compensation and still have not found a new job.

When Members of the House left Washington last week, your spokesman responded to questions about whether the House will take up the Senate bill with: "We're done, we're closed up. Why don't they do [the House bill]?" When the House finished its business last week, House Leadership admonished Senators that it was their responsibility to ensure that a Homeland Security